

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

MS1 - 542US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" (37 CFR 1.5(u)) via EFS Web

on Feb 17, 2006Signature Pam M. PrellwitzTyped or printed name Pam M. Prellwitz

Application Number

09/636,004

Filed

8/9/2000

First Named Inventor

David del Val

Art Unit

2141

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

attorney or agent of record. 46175
Registration number _____



Signature

Tim R. Wyckoff

Typed or printed name

206-315-4001

Telephone number

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____



Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.09/636,004
Filing Date August 9, 2000
Inventorship..... del Val et al.
Assignee Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit 2141
Examiner Nguyen, Quang N
Attorney's Docket No.MS1-542US
Title: FAST DYNAMIC MEASUREMENT OF CONNECTION BANDWIDTH

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

To: **Mail Stop AF**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

From: Tim R. Wyckoff (Tel. 206.315.4001 x110; Fax 206.315.4004)
Customer No. 22801
Lee & Hayes PLLC
421 W Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

REMARKS

The Pre-Appeal Panel (hereinafter "Panel") is respectfully requested to consider this Request, which is submitted in accordance with the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Program rules. A summary of the rejected claims is provided in the Office Action dated November 25, 2005, on pages 2-10 thereof (hereinafter "Office Action"). The Applicant summarized the rejections of record in this Request as well. The Panel is requested to reconsider the rejections of record in view of the following comments and the arguments currently of record.

Rejection of Claims 7-9

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharali et al. (hereinafter "Bharali") in view of Payne et al. (hereinafter "Payne"). The Panel is asked to reconsider this rejection.

1 The Office concedes that Bharali does not teach or suggest various limitations of
2 **independent claim 7.** (See page 3, third paragraph, of the Office Action.) The Office
3 references Payne to address the deficiencies of the Bharali patent. For the reasons that
4 follow, Applicant respectfully submits that Payne does not cure the deficiencies of the
5 Bharali patent.

6 Payne discloses a method and apparatus that monitors conditions of a signal
7 propagation path. The method and apparatus function with both wireless and wired
8 embodiments. Payne uses a connection monitor 40 that is capable of consulting with a
9 modem 36 to deduce or establish a reduced data transfer rate as negotiated by a remote
10 modem. (See column 8, lines 18-20.) Further disclosure related to how the connection
11 monitor 40 deduces or establishes “a reduced data transfer rate as negotiated by a remote
12 modem” is not provided in Payne.

13 The office maintains, on page 3 of the Office Action, last paragraph thereof, that
14 the foregoing disclosure of Payne teaches “determining if the calculated bandwidth is
15 outside a given range of believability for calculated bandwidth, if the calculated
16 bandwidth is determined to be outside the given range of believability: disregarding the
17 calculated bandwidth; and querying a modem of an entity about a bandwidth setting of
18 the modem.” (See **independent claim 7.**) The Applicant fails to understand how the
19 Office has reached this conclusion.

20 The Office’s argument is apparently that Payne consults a modem when
21 performance is “less than desirable”, and that this is the same as determining whether
22 calculated bandwidth is within a “range of believability for calculated bandwidth”
23 However, this argument is without merit, since there is no teaching by Payne that a
24 particular performance evaluation is not “believable.” The assumption in Payne is that
25 “performance less than desirable” is true, and that data transfer rates need to be adjusted

1 as a result. In contrast, as is recited in **Independent claim 7**, the instant claimed
2 invention “*disregard[s] the calculated bandwidth*” when it is deemed as not being
3 *believable*. This is done when a “calculated bandwidth is determined to be outside the
4 *given range of believability*.” Payne makes no reference or suggestion to comparing a
5 calculated bandwidth against a range of believability for calculated bandwidth.

6 Based on the foregoing comments, the Panel is respectfully requested to find that
7 the current rejection of claims 7-9 is improper and therefore must be withdrawn.

8 **Rejection of Claims 19, 21-24, 27-29, 55 and 57**

9 Claims 19, 21-24, 27-29, 55 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
10 being unpatentable over Bharali in view of Linzer. The Panel is asked to reconsider this
11 rejection.

12 **Independent claim 19** recites “receiving a bandwidth value determined based
13 upon measurements related to at least the pair of non-compressible packets, and
14 consideration of a given range of believability related to calculated bandwidth.” The
15 Office has conceded that Bharali does not teach or suggest considering “a given range of
16 believability” in relation to a bandwidth calculation. (See Office Action, page 3, 3rd full
17 paragraph.) Yet, in rejecting **claim 19**, the Office now states that Bharali does indeed
18 teach the limitation. Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this discrepancy.

19 On page 8 of the Office Action, second paragraph, the Office states Bharali
20 discloses “consideration of a given range of believability related to calculated bandwidth
21 (here, the calculated transmission rate 10 bytes per second and 35 bytes per second could
22 be used to implement a given range of believability related to the calculated bandwidth).”
23 (Emphasis added.) In the foregoing, Office is saying Bharali does not teach an aspect of
24 the claimed invention, but a given range of believability *could* be implemented. The

1 Applicant asks how and under what circumstances? An assertion that something *could*
2 *be implemented* is not legally sufficient basis for rejecting **independent claim 19**.

3 Bharali teaches a method and system that is capable of determining current
4 network and bottleneck throughput. As is discussed in column 8, lines 25-33, a small
5 packet and a large packet may be used to determine the throughput of a network. To
6 summarize, Bharali computes the throughput based on a round trip time delay associated
7 with the different sized packets. (See column 8, lines 42-45.) But saying that Bharali
8 discloses or suggests considering “a given range of believability related to calculated
9 bandwidth” when determining network throughput, as the Office asserts, is to do so
10 without any support given by the disclosure of the patent. The Panel is respectfully
11 requested to review the cited portions of Bharali that the Office asserts are relevant to the
12 claimed invention.

13 Based on the foregoing comments, the Panel is respectfully requested to find that
14 the current rejection of claims 19, 21-24, 27-29, 55 and 57 is improper and therefore must
15 be withdrawn.

16 **Rejection of Claims 58-63**

17 Claims 58-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over
18 Bharali in view of Payne, and further in view of Wang (Patent No. 6,118,817). The Panel
19 is asked to reconsider this rejection.

20 For the same reasons discussed in this document, regarding the Payne patent,
21 Applicant submits that the subject matter of **independent claim 58** that recites
22 “determining if the calculated bandwidth is outside a given range of believability for
23 calculated bandwidth” is not rendered obvious by the combination of Bharali, Payne and
24 Wang. The Panel is requested to refer herein to lines 6-15 of page 2 and lines 1-3 of page
25 3.

The Office relies upon Wang to teach the subject matter of **claim 58** that recites “setting a bandwidth to a low-believability threshold...; and setting a bandwidth to a high-believability threshold...” The Office specifically points to column 15, lines 10-60, in the rejection of the claim. The Office asserts that the disclosure relating to increasing or reducing a number of frames produced (frame rate) by a frame rate controller 120 is the same thing as “setting a bandwidth” to either a low or high believability threshold. The Applicant disagrees with the Office understanding of Wang.

Frame rate, or frame frequency, is the measurement of how quickly an imaging device produces unique consecutive images called frames. How quickly the device produces the frames is based on available bandwidth. But producing frames is not the same thing as “setting a bandwidth.” The frame rate controller 120 merely *determines* a bandwidth level and then sets the frame rate accordingly. (See col.15, lines 37-41.)

Conclusion

In accordance with the above, the Panel is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims. The pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2-17-2006

Bv:

Tim R. Wyckoff
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 46,175
(206) 315-4001 ext. 110